CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

NOV | 3 2012

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON,

Plaintiff, Vs.

MEHRDAD SAIDI, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. ED CV 12-1892-UA (DUTYx)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily because defendant removed it improperly.

On October 31, 2012, defendant Mehrdad Saidi, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California Superior Court, lodged a Notice of Removal of that action to this Court, and also presented an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either

diversity or federal question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Here, defendant has asserted both federal question and diversity jurisdiction as his basis for removal. But as described in more detail in the Order Denying Defendant's Request to Proceed Without Prepayment of Filing Fee, because the unlawful detainer action to be removed does not actually raise the federal claims to which defendant points, and because the amount in controversy does not exceed \$75,000, there is no basis to assert either federal question or diversity jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1441.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that: (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Riverside County, Southwest Justice Center, 30755-D Auld Road, Murrieta, CA 92563, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

RABLE GEORGE H. KING UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE